

REMARKS

Applicants wish to express sincere thanks to the Examiner for the benefit of the interview on May 21, 2004. Following the Examiner's suggestion, the claims 1-19 have been amended to put the claimed subject matter in form of method rather than apparatus claims. It is believed that with this amendment the application is put in condition for allowance. By the Office Action of April 27, 2004, claims 1-3, 8-13, and 16-17 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 4,793,400 to Wood and further in view of either JP 9-29,393 ("JP '393") or JP 9-29,394 ("JP '394"); claims 4-7, 14-15, and 18-19 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Wood further in view of either JP '393 or JP '394 as applied in claim 1 above, and further in view of either U.S. Patent No. 3,795,025 to Sadamitsu or U.S. Patent No. 4,530,597 to Itaya et al. (Office Action, pp. 2-3.)

As discussed at the interview and in prior submissions, there is no disclosure or suggestion in Wood of providing two brushes of different character to perform different functions in cleaning the casting surfaces of the casting roll at different times during the casting operation. As previously pointed out, there is no disclosed or suggested by the references of the main brush and/or the sweeper brush being moved independently into engagement with the casting roll surfaces of the casting roll. Moreover, just as Wood teaches away from the presently claimed subject matter, so too does JP '393 and JP '394, as discussed in prior submissions. However, as noted by the Office Action of April 27, 2004, the difference recited in the previous claim involved operation, and therefore, the rejection is premised on ignoring applicants claim limitations because they "involve process step[s] had use 'most'".


As suggested at the interview, the applicants' claim distinctions are quite proper, and can not be ignored, by putting the claimed subject matter in the form of a method rather than apparatus-- as the present amendment does. Thus, Applicants respectfully submits the present claims 1-19, as amended, rewritten in method form and in condition for allowance.

While it is believed that no fees are due in conjunction with this submission, Applicants now authorize the commissioner to charge any fees that may be due, and/or any overpayment in fees, to the Account of Barnes & Thornburg, Deposit Account No. 10-0435, with reference to our matter 29385-68773.

Appl. No. 10/040,092  
Amdt. dated 02 Mar 04  
Reply to Office action of 02 Dec 03

Respectfully,

BARNES & THORNBURG LLP

By:   
Arland T. Stein  
Reg. No. 25.062

11 S. Meridian Street  
Indianapolis, Indiana 46204  
Telephone: (317) 231-7390